

He stated the Department is facing the same concerns about security threat groups and street gangs as localities are. There are several individuals who have been prosecuted successfully and who are coming into the Department, particularly from Northern Virginia where there are approximately 3,000 known or associated members of MS-13

that have been identified by local law enforcement. He spoke about MS-13, which is an Hispanic group that is probably the most vicious gang that the Department will have to deal with in the near future. He stated at least 28 different gangs have been identified within the system and that the Department has five or six sets from national gangs but most are local gangs coming from different localities. He stated there is a common belief that most gangs come from cities or either Northern Virginia or Tidewater or Richmond but that is not the case. The Department is getting gang members from Coburn, Roanoke, Lynchburg, Bristol, and Emporia.

Mr. Sisk remarked on the gang initiative from the Governor and Attorney General's Offices and mentioned that the Secretary of Public Safety has convened a task force, which is looking into this problem as it affects all communities. He stated that gang members come into the Department and recruit, which is part of the gang's main mission.

The Security Threat Group Unit is being finalized and once established, the unit will be assisting both institutional and probation and parole staff as well as some outside law enforcement agencies. Approximately 3200 institutional staff and about 350 probation and parole officers have already been trained, and the training will continue. The unit will have a database, which will try to identify all known gang members within the Department, especially looking at the leaders, recruiters, and strong-armers. If it is determined a gang member needs to go to Level 6 Red Onion, they will go. In other cases, if a member's behavior is such that are not doing anything, they will be identified and monitored. The Department will not use only the fact that somebody has a gang tattoo as a major factor in sending them to a Level 6 bed.

Mr. Sisk stated that the Department wants to be proactive now. He noted that many jurisdictions do not want to admit that they have gangs, but denial is what puts them behind the eight ball in dealing with the gang problem. Gangs are a safety issue for the Department, both as relates to officers and to staff. As a result, a big part of the unit's education program is creating an awareness of gangs, what they look like, and what their mentality is.

In closing, Mr. Sisk stated he would be willing to bring a more comprehensive presentation to the Board in the near future using a power point presentation, which talks about the gang mentality. At this point, several general questions were proffered by Board members. After discussion, the Chairman thanked Mr. Sisk for his presentation and agreed that the Board would like to have a more detailed presentation at a meeting sometime in the future.

#### **IV. Liaison Committee (Mr. Proffitt)**

The Committee met on May 18. The Chairman of the Board as well as Members Fraser and Mitchell were in attendance. The meeting was chaired by Superintendent Roy Cherry of Hampton Roads Regional Jail and was very informative and very well attended.

Mr. Proffitt stated Mr. Bert Jones had presented the committee with updated funding information for several Department capital projects approved by the General Assembly: Phase II of St. Brides for 800 beds; the 600-bed Deerfield expansion; a new 1,024-bed, medium-security prison in Tazewell; a second, medium-security prison in Pittsylvania County with a certification concerning bed space to be completed by the Secretary's Office prior to starting the project; medium-security III in the Mount Rogers Planning District for which plans are to be submitted by the end of this year; and medium-security IV, which will be in Charlotte County.

He noted Mr. Ron Elliott then followed with a report on the population of jails and prisons and that as of May 17, the Department population stood at 31,446, which compares to 31,005 approximately two months ago. The local jail population as of April 20, 2004, stood at 24,821. Their capacity as of May 1, 2004, was 16,920. Since last meeting, there again was a noticeable drop in the out-of-compliance figure. Mr. Proffitt stated that the Director and staff should continue to be commended for their efforts to reduce the out-of-compliance numbers.

Also during the jail construction portion of his report, Mr. Elliott remarked that the request for additional state jail construction funding reimbursement by Middle River Regional Jail was approved by the Board in March. The total eligible costs are now \$43,957,360 of which \$21,978,680 or 50% will be state reimbursed. Site work and foundations for Middle River are completed and they estimate completion in February, 2006. Loudoun County: site work completed with foundations being laid. Virginia Beach: the kitchen floor pavers, elevators, duct work having been installed and the exterior brick façade is 90 percent completed. Interior painting expected to begin this week. Their completion date for the new addition is October, 2004, with renovations being completed in October, 2005. Pre-cast cell installation has been completed at two sites of the Southwest Virginia Regional Jail. The Chesterfield County Jail is progressing. Early site work began at the Eastern Shore Regional Jail as of the first of May. The Prince William/Manassas project is undergoing a plan review by Prince William County with an estimated project start date of December, 2004, and an estimated completion date of December, 2006.

It was noted there are several new jail projects in the mill: 325 beds for the Clarke/Fauquier/Frederick/Winchester Adult Detention Center; new construction for the Appomattox/Amherst/Nelson Regional Jail; and expansion projects for the Hampton Roads Regional Jail, Gloucester County Jail, Roanoke County/City of Salem Jail, Riverside Regional Jail, and the Rappahannock Regional Jail.

Also discussed during the Committee meeting was the revision to the Model Plan for the \$1.00 a day per diem, which will be covered in full during Ms. Maxey's report. There have been some slight changes to that Model Plan and the information will be going out to the jails.

The report was completed. No action on the report is required by the Board. The Chairman thanked Mr. Proffitt for his report.

V. Administration Committee (Mr. Wright)

1) Proposed Resolution for Lease/Purchase of Former Jarratt Egg Building for DOC Agribusiness Program

It is proposed to move the operations from its facility in Courtland to the former egg building in Jarratt. The interesting aspect of this is the fact that everything is going to move except the egg operation to the egg building. It is the committee's recommendation to approve the requested action. The key component is the fact that this is a lease to purchase versus a straight lease on the other facility.

The motion on the resolution was duly made by Mr. Wright and seconded by Mr. Mitchell. The *MOTION* was unanimously *APPROVED* by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Maxey, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright). There were no opposing votes. As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, the Chairman's vote was not noted. Two members were absent.

For purposes of the record, the approved Resolution is entered into the record in total and reads as follows:

**BOARD OF CORRECTIONS RESOLUTION, APPROVING THE PARTICIPATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AS THE LESSEE FOR A REFRIGERATED WAREHOUSE FACILITY KNOWN AS THE JARRATT EGG BUILDING IN JARRATT, VIRGINIA.**

**WHEREAS**, Chapter 943 of the 2004 Acts of Assembly (the "Act") authorizes the participation of the Department of Corrections (the "Department") as the lessee for a refrigerated warehouse facility known as the Jarratt Egg Building to be renovated and equipped by the Town of Jarratt, Virginia (the "Town") at Jarratt, Virginia (the "Project") and to be used in the Department's Agribusiness Program; and,

**WHEREAS**, it is the duty of the Board to approve the acquisition of property by the Department, and,

**WHEREAS** under the terms of the lease it shall be required that the property be conveyed to the Commonwealth at the end of the Lease period.

**NOW BE IT RESOLVED:** that the Board of Corrections acknowledges its approval for the Department to proceed as a participant in the Project, including without limitation, serving as project inspector under the related bond indenture; to enter into a lease agreement for such refrigerated warehouse facility; and to execute any other certificates, agreements or instruments appropriate to further the intent and purposes of the Act and the issuance of tax-exempt bonds to finance the costs of the Project.

This approval is subject to the following conditions as are prescribed in part in the Act:

1. The lease shall have a term up to fifteen (15) years from the date of its execution, or occupancy of the facility, as may be mutually agreed. Lease payments shall begin as of a date certain, but in no event later than June 30, 2005, and shall be sufficient to pay debt service and administrative expenses on the bonds to be issued by the Town and to repay the Town for the cost of the property as contemplated by the Act. At the conclusion of the term of the lease agreement and the payment of the bonds to be issued to finance the Project, the subject real property and improvements thereto shall convey to the Commonwealth, at no additional cost, in fee simple.

2. The construction contract for the Project shall require the acknowledgement of the Department.

3. The total bond issuance to finance the costs for the Project must not exceed \$800,000. The terms and structure of the bonds to be issued for the Project must be approved by the State Treasury Board.

Adopted May 19, 2004

*(Signature copy on file)*

---

Chairman of the Board of Corrections  
of the Commonwealth of Virginia

The Chairman thanked Mr. Wright for his report.

**VI. Correctional Services Committee Report/Policy & Regulations (Ms. Maxey)**

By *MOTION* duly made by Ms. Maxey and seconded by Ms. Fraser, the following recommendations were presented to the Board for approval:

**Unconditional Certification** for the following jails and lockup as a result of **100% compliance** for **Lynchburg Adult Detention Center, Danville City Jail, and the Galax City Lockup;**

And, **Unconditional Certification** for **Bristol City Jail, Culpeper County Jail, Henry County Jail, Gloucester Probation & Parole District #5, and the Newport News Probation & Parole District #19;**

And **Unconditional Certification with waivers as approved by the ACA Commission on Accreditation** for **Pamunkey Regional Jail** with a waiver on Standard 2D-03; **Clarke/Frederick/Winchester Regional Jail** with a waiver on Standards 2D-05 and 4B-04; and **Roanoke County Jail** with waivers on Standards 2C-04, 2C-07, 2C-10, and 2D-03;

And **Unconditional Certification** for **Fairfax County Adult Detention Center** with waivers as approved by the ACA Commission on Accreditation for Standards 2C-01, 2C-12, 2D-03, 2D-05, 2D-06 and 4B-04; and waivers recommended by the Committee for Standards 2C-08 and 2C-10, and the detention of male juveniles in accordance with Section 16.1-249(g), Code of Virginia;

And that the action on **Riverside Regional Jail**, which was unconditionally certified at the March Board meeting, **be revised to include approval to house male and female juveniles in accordance with Section 16.1-249(g) of the Code of Virginia.**

After the call for question and discussion, the *MOTION* was unanimously *APPROVED* by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Maxey, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright). There were no opposing votes. As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, the Chairman's vote was not noted. Two members were absent.

The **Portsmouth City Jail** was audited in February, 2004, and was found non-compliant with Standard 6VAC-15-40-680 regarding visitation for work release inmates. The Sheriff requested a waiver for that Standard because the work center is surrounded by railroad tracks on two sides and the interstate highway and an exit ramp on the other side and has written that it is not practical to install a visiting station in the fence line and that work release candidates will be advised that those participating in the program may forfeit their visitation rights. As a result of the Committee's discussion and recommendation, Ms. Maxey made the *MOTION* that the *WAIVER* for Standard 6VAC-15-40-680 as requested by the Portsmouth City Jail *NOT BE APPROVED*. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fraser.

After the call for question and discussion, the motion was unanimously approved as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Maxey, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright). There were no opposing votes. As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, the Chairman's vote was not noted. Two members were absent.

For informational purposes, the facilities who had received **100% compliance on their unannounced inspections** were noted for the record. Those facilities are: the **Blacksburg Town Lockup** and **Henrico County Jail – East**.

The **Roanoke City Jail** underwent an unannounced Life, Health and Safety inspection during April, 2004. The jail was found in non-compliance with Standards 6VAC-15-40-450, regarding the suicide prevention and intervention plan, and 6VAC-15-40-1080, emergency situations. These related to the jail's written standard operating procedures requirements that staff are to review the suicide prevention and intervention plans and emergency situations every six months. However, the Standard only requires that they do this review once every 12 months, and they were found in non-compliance for not abiding by their written policy. By letter addressed to Director Gene M. Johnson dated April 15, 2004, the sheriff appealed the finding of non-compliance.



The Committee discussed the appeal and suicides in local facilities in general. Mr. Elliott explained the Board's role as to suicide reporting as far as the current mandate is concerned. By Board Standard, it is required of all local facilities to report any suicide incidents to the Department within 24 hours. Mr. Barry Green, Deputy Secretary for Public Safety, made the suggestion that because the Board is responsible for the Standards that at least it might look to see if there was anything the Board ought to be doing over and above what is happening now. He stated his concern not only for what is happening in the state system, but local facilities as well. Mr. Elliott reiterated the fact that the Compliance & Accreditation Unit has those suicide reports, but they are not categorized nor is an attempt made to put them in a report format in terms of a statistical report. Mr. Green suggested that perhaps if a summary was provided to the Liaison Committee and the Board as a whole in order to take a look and see if there is anything further that needs to be done, it would address his concern.

After this discussion, the following was recommended:

By *MOTION* duly made by Ms. Maxey, seconded by Mr. Burrell, the Board of Corrections *DENIES* the *APPEAL* of the Roanoke City Jail. The motion was unanimously approved as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Maxey, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright). There were no opposing votes. As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, the Chairman's vote was not noted. Two members were absent.

**Motion to Approve Variance Requests by Friends of Guest House, Inc.**

Ms. Maxey stated that the Committee had met and discussed the facility's request. Mr. Peter Lunt, the representative of Friends of Guest House, was present at that time to answer any questions and to provide any update required. Their request is for a temporary waiver from May 19 to November 30, 2004, to utilize electronic surveillance in lieu of an awake person from the hours of 9:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. and to suspend the population count by staff every two hours during that time period. The majority of the Committee was in favor of this request; therefore, the Committee is recommending by way of motion to the full Board that:

The Board of Corrections *APPROVES* the request of Friends of Guest House for *VARIANCES* to Community Residential Standards for 6VAC15-70-80B and 6VAC15-70-90C2, for the period May 19, 2004, to November 30, 2004. The variances allow the residential program to utilize electronic surveillance in lieu of an "awake" person from the hours of 9:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. and to suspend a population count by staff every two hours during the same period. The Board has no obligation to reconsider these approved variances at the conclusion of the approved variance expiration date.

The *MOTION* was seconded by Ms. Fraser. After the call for question and discussion, the motion was unanimously approved as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright). There was one opposing vote (Maxey). As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, the Chairman's vote was not noted. Two members were absent.

**Motion to Modify Previously Approved Model Plan Language**

Information regarding this proposal was included in the Board package. It consisted of history where the Board had previously approved an emergency regulation in the form of a Model Plan as required by Section 53.1-131.3 back in September, 2003. This was regarding Payment of Costs Associated With Prisoner Keep, and the Department had some concerns. Chairman Hester requested that the committee that had been put together come back together, and in working with Mr. Hagenlocker, facilitated a meeting of the original Model Plan Committee to consider and evaluate the Department's concerns. Issues addressed were the providing of funds collected from those inmates adjudicated not guilty, and those funds for those inmates identified as state responsible. The question of whether these would be exempt from the fee collection had not been addressed at the beginning.

Revisions have been made, and Ms. Maxey offered the following motion for approval by the Board:

To approve the Model Plan as revised in conjunction with Code of Virginia Section 53.1-131.3; Payment of Costs Associated With Prisoner Keep, effective July 1, 2003. The previously approved Plan will be worded the same except for the fourth paragraph under the heading Introduction. That paragraph will be replaced with the following:

"The result of this research has been the development of a Model Plan to help guide Virginia Sheriffs or Superintendents who elect to establish a program to charge in-house inmates (regardless of jurisdictional responsibility notwithstanding) a reasonable fee, not to exceed \$1.00 per day, to defray the costs associated with the prisoners' keep."

Also, added to number one under the heading Program Component, is the following:

"Procedures shall include provisions for a refund to any person held in a jail/local lockup who is adjudicated "not guilty" on all filed charges. Any person receiving deferred adjudication by the Court pending community corrections programming or whose charges are dismissed/nolle prosequi as the result of successfully fulfilling other court mandates shall not be eligible for a refund. Any inmate eligible for a refund must submit a request in writing within 60 days of his/her release. Refunds shall be made from the appropriate funding sources, e.g. commissary funds."

The *MOTION* was seconded by Ms. Fraser.

In addition, the Chairman noted that in the first sentence in number one under the heading Program Component, the word "state" was added after federal where it says, "Written policy and procedure, unless federal contract precludes...". The committee amended that to say, "Written policy and procedure, unless federal/state contract precludes...". It was determined that adding that additional word would suffice. And it was stated there was strong feeling everywhere that people who were found not guilty on all charges should



have an opportunity to get a refund. The Chairman then called for discussion on the Motion.

During discussion, the Director asked how the change affected out-of-compliance inmates. The Chairman noted that the feeling of the Committee was that until the Department takes charge of them, they remain local prisoners. In other words, they may be out of compliance, but they are still local until the Department takes them in and so if they are in the local jail, they still belong to the local jail until they are taken in, even though they are out of compliance. The Director voiced some concern about the Department's standing if it was sued, and Mr. Proffitt remarked that Superintendent Cherry at Hampton Roads Regional Jail had already been sued, and the federal judge basically told the inmate that he would need to comply. The Chairman noted Mr. Cherry had brought copies of the case with him, they had reviewed it, and it was very favorable. The bottom line, from his recollection, was that state-responsible inmates had requested to have their dollar returned. The Director, not knowing how the suit was worded, was of the opinion that perhaps the point of the suit was that because the inmate was state responsible, the jail should not be charging him; but that then the inmate will sue the Department and will word it as since I am out of compliance, the state has to be responsible. The Chairman responded by saying he believed part of the inmate's contention was the state should have taken him in already and they have not done it so they should be responsible, and the court ruled against him on that.

The Chairman called for any further discussion. There being none, the *MOTION* was unanimously *APPROVED* as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Maxey, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright). There were no opposing votes. As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, the Chairman's vote was not noted. Two members were absent.

For the purposes of the record, the Model Plan was entered in its entirety as indicated below:

### **Introduction**

The 2003 session of the Virginia General Assembly passed House Bill 2765 which became law effective July 1, 2003. This legislation amended the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered 53.1-131.3 as follows:

Any sheriff or jail superintendent may establish a program to charge inmates a reasonable fee, not to exceed \$1.00 per day, to defray the costs associated with the prisoners' keep. The Board shall develop a Model Plan and adopt regulations for such program, and shall provide assistance, if requested, to the sheriff or jail superintendent in the implementation of such program. Such funds shall be retained in the locality where the funds were collected and shall be used for general jail purposes.

In compliance with the requirement of House Bill 2765 that the Board of Corrections develop a Model Plan for such a program, a committee of Sheriffs, Jail Administrators, Board of Corrections members and Department of Corrections staff was organized. A

literature review and interviews with administrators of similar programs throughout the country were conducted. The Macomb County, Michigan Jail in 1985, developed the first fee charging payment of costs associated with prisoners' keep program. Base fees are from \$6.00 to \$56.00 with annual revenues exceeding \$200,000. The committee could not find any successful litigation challenging the implementation of such fees.

The result of this research has been the development of a Model Plan to help guide Virginia Sheriffs or Superintendents who elect to establish a program to charge in-house inmates (regardless of jurisdictional responsibility notwithstanding) a reasonable fee, not to exceed \$1.00 per day, to defray the costs associated with the prisoners' keep.

### **Program Components**

Based upon a review of existing programs in the nation and Virginia's medical copay program the following components are considered essential for successful implementation of programs charging fee for prisoners' keep programs:

1. Written policy and procedure, unless federal/state contract precludes, which addresses items such as fee amount, inmate orientation and notification, payment and refund procedures and accounting procedures, and which, if any inmates are exempted. Procedures shall include provisions for a refund to any person held in a jail/local lockup who is adjudicated "not guilty" on all filed charges. Any person receiving deferred adjudication by the Court pending community corrections programming or whose charges are dismissed/nolle prosequi as the result of successfully fulfilling other court mandates shall not be eligible for a refund. Any inmate eligible for a refund must submit a request in writing within 60 days of his/her release. Refunds shall be made from the appropriate funding sources, e.g. commissary funds.
2. Development of administrative forms; and
3. Staff training for security and administrative personnel.

### **Model Plan**

Upon the commitment of an inmate to jail, intake processing should include the issuance of a written statement informing the inmate of the fee for prisoners' keep program and method of payment. Orientation should include all pertinent information on fees and program areas. Inmate's signature should be required to document notification.

If the release date and the date of arrival are within 24 hours, the inmate shall be charged only the equivalent of one day's fee.

Whenever an inmate has been charged the prisoner's keep fee, the deduction shall be reflected on the inmate's account. Should the inmate have no funds, then the account may be debited until funds are available.

In closing, Ms. Maxey noted that in July, the Board will have before it the proposed policy regarding the physical exams required for probation and parole officers that often

keeps them out of full compliance. Currently the policy is at the Attorney General's Office for review and should be ready for the full Board at the July meeting.

Ms. Maxey also mentioned how she wanted to thank Mr. Joe Hagenlocker for his immense help to the Correctional Services Committee and how he has made a tremendous contribution to their work. It was suggested that some sort of resolution might be given. A discussion on the suggestion was held later on in the Board meeting. At the conclusion of her report, the Chairman thanked her.

## **VII. Other Business (Mr. Johnson)**

The Director followed up on Mr. Sisk's report on the security threat groups and the fact that they are becoming more prevalent. He remarked that the Governor is quite concerned about the problem statewide. As a result of the Governor's concerns, the Department will be increasing its vigilance and has been gearing up for this for at least the last six months. He stated that the Department has done some work with local as well as State Police and federal courts, and the feedback received is that the Department is a lot further along than most and that Mr. Sisk and his staff are doing a good job.

As a follow up on legislation, the Director noted he was very pleased with how well the Department came out after the conclusion of the General Assembly session. He remarked that the Department is well thought of in most cases, that they realize the Department has done more than its share as a result of the budget shortages in the last few years, and the concern that some of that money needed to be replaced and there were some things that were needed, particularly beds.

In closing, the Director thanked Chairman Hester for coming to the Department's Awards Banquet for those employees receiving service awards for 25 years or more of state service, which is always a special occasion and was no less this year. The Governor's Chief of Staff, Bill Leighty, was the Guest Speaker. The Director noted that it is a very important part of our year to recognize the people that do so much for all of us. The Director then concluded his remarks.

The Chairman then asked Deputy Secretary Green if he had anything for the Board. Mr. Green requested to be placed on the Board Agenda in order to present information as to an initiative his office has been working on in conjunction with the Department as well as other agencies, both inside and outside Public Safety, on the prisoner re-entry issue. He stated the work focused on reducing prisoner recidivism rates with a large portion dealing with technical violators and reducing the number of technical violators that are coming back into the system.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Green for his comments and stated the Board would look forward to having him come back for a presentation.

Mr. Hester then welcomed Mr. Katz, from the Attorney General's office, and Ms. Sievers, from the Parole Board. Ms. Sievers stated that she was very interested in the gang report and was interested in how this information can help the Parole Board. Then

Mr. Leininger reminded the Board of a Bill put forward during the last session, which would have greatly changed the composition of this body, and noted that the Department had been successful in seeing that that was put aside. He then presented a copy of an email to each member of the Board that the Department had received as an indication that the sponsor group of that original Bill has not given up and stated it is obviously their intent to move forward with that issue again next session.

#### **VIII. Closed Session**

There were no items to be discussed during closed session.

#### **IX. Member and General Comment**

The Chairman spoke at this time and referenced the appeals previously discussed during Ms. Maxey's report. He stated that he did not understand the appeals process and referenced two that had come up during the Correctional Services Committee meeting, one addressed to Mr. Johnson and one addressed to the Board. He reiterated that the regulations state that all local facility appeals must come before the Board, and that is why the committee acted on it, but he did not know if the official making the appeal should then be invited to come before the Board to present their case.

Mr. Proffitt agreed that they should at least be notified and given the opportunity to present their case. Mr. Green agreed with the fact that they should be given the opportunity to appear and if then if they do not show, that is fine but that something should be sent to them to the effect that your appeal has been noted and will be voted on at this meeting, and if you would like to come and present your case, please let us know. He stated that people should know that they have been heard and that they have had an opportunity to have questions asked. Ms. Maxey then asked who would be responsible for inviting them and Mr. Elliott explained the Compliance & Accreditation Unit would be responsible. The Chairman stated that if the Board is going to get appeals, it needs to have some kind of procedure for handling them but that they should be invited.

The Director reminded the Board that he understood that before appeals come to the full Board, they should come to the committee because the committee is supposed to be the one recommending it to the full Board. The Chairman agreed and made the recommendation that for the future, we invite them to the (Correctional Services) Policy & Regulations Committee and then let them come before the Board if they want to.

As a follow up to Ms. Maxey's earlier statement during her committee report, the Chairman again mentioned the fact that Mr. Joe Hagenlocker was retiring. He stated how very helpful Mr. Hagenlocker has been to both the Liaison Committee and the (Correctional Services) Policy & Regulation Committee, and he wanted to know if there was any feeling among the Board members to ask that a resolution of appreciation be prepared for presentation to Mr. Hagenlocker at a time to be determined. Mr. Leininger's office will take care of preparing the resolution and will arrange to have Mr. Hagenlocker come back for the presentation.

Mr. Proffitt noted that he and the Chairman had the privilege of attending the National Correctional Officers' Week Ceremony for the Department on May 4, 2004, and that the Secretary of Public Safety and Mr. Barry Green were there. He stated it was a very well-done ceremony and it is very well deserved. Also, he told the other Board members that the Chairman had appeared at the Virginia Association of Regional Jails Conference in April and that the Chairman was the keynote speaker during the luncheon. He thanked the Chairman for his kind remarks. In addition, Mr. Proffitt noted that the Central Virginia Regional Jail had held a Public Safety Officers' Memorial Ceremony on May 14, 2004, and he then proceeded to read the names of the eight law enforcement officers who had lost their lives in the line of duty in Virginia last year.

Ms. Fraser suggested there might be some way for Board members to be notified of important events happening within the Department, either by email or whether it be put on the Department's web site, to help ensure more participation by Board members. Mr. Leininger's noted that his office will ensure that this is taken care of.

Mr. Burrell noted that New Kent County will be celebrating its 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary on June 11, 2004, and extended an invitation to all to come down to help celebrate.

There being no further discussion, the Chairman moved to conclude the meeting.

**X. Future Meeting Plans**

**This information has been provided to Board Members previously and is provided now for the purposes of the record. No discussion was held with reference to the upcoming schedule during the Board Meeting.**

**The July meetings are scheduled as follows:**

**Liaison Committee** – 10:00 a.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia, July 13, 2004.

**Correctional Services/Policy & Regulations Committee** – 1:00 p.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia, July 13, 2004.

**Administration Committee** – 9:30 a.m., Room 3065, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia, July 14, 2004.

**Board Meeting** – 10:00 a.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia, July 14, 2004.

**XI. Adjournment**

There being nothing further, by *MOTION* duly made and seconded and unanimously *APPROVED* by those members in attendance (Burrell, Fraser, Maxey, Mitchell, Proffitt, Wright), the meeting was adjourned. There were no opposing votes. As a tie-breaking vote was not necessary, a vote by the Chairman was not noted. There were two absences.

---

CLAY B. HESTER, CHAIRMAN

*(Signature copy on file)*

---

RAYMOND W. MITCHELL, SECRETARY